



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TEACHING OF FIRST-YEAR LATIN.¹

Nor long ago I read with much interest a paper by Professor Johnston, of the University of Indiana, on the teaching of second-year Latin. He began with the statement that the work of the second year is very generally disappointing to the teachers, and closed with the following summing up of suggestions: Make the assignment of work absolutely definite, so precise that the pupil may anticipate every question you ask. Preserve the emphasis throughout the year; don't shift it from term to term, much less from week to week or from day to day. Make good English translations the important thing. Don't make a little tin god of the word "thoroughness:" leave something for the pupil to learn the next day; be thankful that he translates an ablative correctly, even if he can't name it. Lastly, don't make the little girl cry. It seems to me that Mr. Johnston's opening sentence is quite as true of the first year of Latin as of the second—for who will deny that the results are generally very disappointing?—and that his suggestions apply equally well to the first year, and, if carried out then, would leave less cause for the little girl's tears in the second.

But, admirable as his suggestions are, there are certain peculiar conditions and difficulties that surround the work of the first year that call for special consideration and treatment. The difficulties are inherent in the language itself, the conditions are the character of the secondary-school curriculum, the available text-books, and the methods employed in teaching. Let us consider these in order.

The language.—With most students Latin is the first language studied. From a native tongue, made up of short detached sentences and uninflected parts of speech, they are introduced to the periodic structure and highly inflected language of the Romans. No amount of enthusiasm can blind us to the fact that

¹ A paper read at the May meeting of the "Chicago and Cook County High School Principals' Association."

Latin is hard. After twenty-five years of conscientious study, I am more than ever impressed with this fact, and can quite sympathize with the remark of the youthful Heine, that the reason why the Romans conquered the world was because they did not have to learn Latin. Not only is the Latin itself hard, but the ideas and civilization that it presents are perhaps even harder to the beginner. It is a different world to which he is introduced, and not a mere difference in speech. That is undoubtedly one of the reasons why children find the modern languages so much easier than Latin, and why American children, when abroad, so quickly find themselves at home with foreigners. But here we have a world separated from our own by a chasm of two thousand years, with different public and private life, a different religion—in fact, different in every respect. In view of all this, it is well that our boys and girls do not know what is before them when they rush into the difficulties of the first year, and it is only the sublime courage of ignorance that sustains them through the trial.

But not only are there these difficulties, but also the conditions imposed by the character of our school curriculum, the available text-books, and the methods of teaching.

The curriculum.—The Latin course in the vast majority of our secondary schools is one of four years. The number of schools giving a five- or six-years' course is so small, at least in the West, as to be practically a negligible quantity. Even in Chicago, where the signs were promising for a longer course, I am told that a longer course is at present being given in but two schools. Now, what that means for our Latin pupils is simply this: that they are expected to do as much work in one year as the German boy with more hours a week and with better teachers does in two or even three years. The two lowest classes in the gymnasia of Prussia and Bavaria give eight hours a week to Latin; in Saxony, Baden, and Hesse they give nine, and in Wurtemberg they give ten. In no case do they think of reading Cæsar till the third or fourth year. Under these circumstances, can we be surprised that our pupils come up to the second year with a very limited vocabulary, slow and uncertain

apprehension of forms, and a very hazy notion of syntactical possibilities. In a word, they are only half prepared; and while they attack their history, mathematics, and science lessons with the conscious power of achievement, they have to struggle desperately to keep their heads above water in Latin, and have the constant and growing feeling that it is a little too much for them. Many sink in the struggle and only the most vigorous survive, "Rari nantes in gurgite vasto."

The text-books.—Professor Bennett, of Cornell, in his recent book on the "Teaching of Latin and Greek," scores the current Beginners' Latin Books with much justice. But they reflect, as well as determine, the methods of teaching most employed, and the fact of their acceptance and well nigh universal use seems to show that teachers generally are satisfied with them. The fact is that we are still in a transition from the old to the new régime in aims and methods, and until we are fully committed to the new the present books will be used. Under the old régime, when the doctrine of former culture sat enthroned, the disciplinary value of the classics was the all-sufficient argument for their pursuit; rules were valuable in proportion to their difficulty and the number of exceptions, and students were reasonably in doubt whether the subjunctive was made for man or man for the subjunctive. Against this senseless exaltation of grammar and syntax there was a natural revolt. We are now supposed to have left this behind, and our professed aim is to lead the pupil by the shortest and easiest way to a reading knowledge of the language; grammar, and syntax being valuable only so far as they assist in accomplishing this result. This, I say, is our professed aim and purpose, but we are still in no small degree exalting syntax with beginners beyond what is wise or pedagogically sound, and we are doing it at the expense of other things that are of much more importance to a pupil at that stage of progress. In the first year forms and vocabulary should have the first place with a minimum of syntax. In actual practice forms and syntax are neck and neck in the race for preferment, with vocabulary hopelessly in the rear. And yet the failure to read Latin easily is usually a failure to know the meanings of the words or the sig-

nificance of a form, and but rarely a weakness in syntax. What is worse, we confuse and obstruct a pupil's efforts to master his forms by compelling him to make a formal study of constructions at the same time, with the result that he learns neither well. An examination of the books and methods used in other countries, and especially of those used by *sexta* and *quinta*, the two lowest classes in German schools, shows a very different condition of affairs. These two years the pupil spends with scarcely any formal study of syntax, and the whole first year passes without taking up formally a single subjunctive construction. On the other hand, he has learned *thoroughly* the declensions and conjugations, and has acquired a large vocabulary by the systematic making and learning of word lists and the copious reading of simple Latin. In this translating he is taught to recognize the simplest constructions; but they are not taken up formally for study.

At the end of two years he has met in his reading, and can recognize, the following: direct and indirect object, the ablative with special verbs, the ablative of time, the genitive with adjectives, clauses with *ut* and *ne*, the three forms of condition, the accusative of time and space, the accusative with the infinitive, the constructions with names of towns, and the commoner uses of participles. The formal study of constructions is taken up in the third and fourth years, largely by the inductive study of what has been read during the first two years. Of course our curriculum does not permit of our following this method in full, but it suggests that we make too much of syntax, and not enough of forms and vocabulary. It suggests, too, that our beginners' books are seriously in error when they shift the emphasis now to this thing and then to that from day to day and from week to week. One thing at a time, and that done well, is as good a rule here as elsewhere. Another more serious error for which the beginners' books are responsible, an error to which Professor Bennett¹ also calls attention in the book mentioned above, is that these manuals not only attempt to teach forms and syntax at the same time, but that there is no per-

¹ *The Teaching of Latin and Greek*, BENNETT and BRISTOL, p. 54.

ceptible plan in the presentation of material. In this they violate every known law of psychology and pedagogy. Surely it is axiomatic that things belonging together should be taught together, and that by the very structure of our minds we remember most easily things which stand in a recognized logical relation to each other. But the beginners' book, on the plea of variety and creation of greater interest, gives us now a bit of the the noun, then of the adjective, then of the verb, then a little more of the noun again, and so on, while a similar lack of coherence marks the presentation of the syntax. Surely the five declensions of nouns are intimately connected, and can be best learned and remembered in association, the same is true of the declension of the other parts of speech and of the four conjugations. So, too, the different divisions of the genitive, dative, accusative, etc., are best learned in relation the one to the other. Every Latin Grammar recognizes this tacitly in the arrangement of its material. What would we think of a grammar that did not do so! And yet we are asked to spread these *disiecta membra* before young and helpless pupils, with the unwarranted hope that by some miraculous process of their untrained and immature minds they will be able to make out of this chaos a well ordered and systematized knowledge of the essentials of the language. The beginners' book of today is a great improvement over the Latin Reader of a generation ago, in so far as students are at once introduced to the complete sentence, and not kept for weeks on a monotonous and juiceless pabulum of isolated words and meaningless phrases, but I feel that this advantage has been purchased at a great loss in the thoroughness and accuracy which can come only from well systematized and integrated knowledge. Teachers that have been in the work as long as I, and can remember the boys that came up to college under the old régime, or can remember their own schooling under it, will agree with me that boys then knew their grammar much better than they do now, and especially their forms. We studied the grammar directly in those days, taking up each subject in its logical order, and for drill we had the Latin Reader, based upon and following the order of the gram-

mar. The work lacked the variety of the methods of today, but it was strongly concentrative, and was by no means lacking in interest.

But the beginners' book, with all its faults, has probably come to stay. It is a convenience, and appeals to the ignorance of the untried teacher and the inertia of the experienced ones. Further, it is cheap—which is an unanswerable argument to the average school board. This being a condition, and not a theory, what are we going to do about it? and how may the work of the first year be made fairly successful in spite of the evils that so sorely beset us? The first thing to do is to keep clearly in mind the aim in view, and to admit nothing that does not minister directly to this object. This aim I take to be to lead the pupil as directly and as easily as possible to a good reading knowledge of Latin. Questions that come up for consideration during the first year are mainly the following: (1) How shall we teach pronunciation, how much attention shall we give to it and to the marking of vowels? (2) How may a large vocabulary best be acquired? (3) How shall forms be taught? (4) How much syntax shall be taught, and how is a working knowledge of syntax best imparted? (5) What is the relative value of translating from Latin into English and from English into Latin? (6) What should we read?

1. How shall we teach pronunciation? How much attention shall we give to it and to the marking of vowels?

On this subject I quote from the *Prussian Courses of Study*, p. 23, the following: "The burdening of instruction with the refinements of pronunciation is not to be recommended." The essentials of pronunciation are best taught by imitation. No time should be wasted by a beginner on learning rules of the sounds of letters. He will learn these much better from the lips of his teacher, who should always read clearly and distinctly, especially during the opening weeks, every sentence before it is read by the pupil, and should also pronounce each new vocabulary before it is assigned as a lesson. It is easy to carry the refinements of pronunciation too far, and to give it too much time relative to its importance. I believe that we should be

satisfied to concentrate our attention on the last two syllables of the word, paying particular attention to the accent. That is as much as the Germans pretend to do even in their seminary courses in the universities. The result is that you rarely if ever hear a German student make a mistake in the accent of a word, while we, in attempting to secure more, fail of even that. We are just now under special stress in this matter because the matter of quantity is at present something of a hobby among American philologists. While we all rejoice with them that many of the uncertainties of quantity have been cleared up, we quite agree with Professor Bennett when he says: "Many college teachers, in their enthusiasm for the scientific aspects of their own professional work, exhibit a tendency to demand that the teaching of their own subject in the secondary schools shall be conducted with express reference to the ultimate needs of the higher scholarship."¹ So, in this matter of quantity, if we follow the lead of the specialists, we shall fall into the grievous error of spending our time in the tithing of mint and anise and cumin, while neglecting the weightier matters of the law. Especially is this true in the first year where so much that is absolutely fundamental is pressing for the most earnest attention. From what I have said thus far on this theme you will readily infer that I do not believe in asking beginners to memorize quantities, more particularly not the hidden quantities. I doubt if there be a single Latinist in the country that could mark correctly all the quantities in the first ten pages of Cæsar, even provided that they were all known, which they are not. Yet, only yesterday I was reading a paper in an educational journal on the teaching of first-year Latin, in which particular stress was laid on the necessity of having pupils mark *all* the quantities. I have myself a daughter who is attending a school where this task is imposed on the beginners' class. I recently looked over some of her work and found that the quantities were marked with conscientious accuracy. But when I tested her on the declensions and conjugations she showed painful weakness, and her vocabulary—well, the less said about that the better. Is it not

¹ *The Teaching of Latin and Greek*, BENNETT and BRISTOL, p. 80.

clear that here was a serious blunder in teaching, a lack of perspective, an undue and disastrous emphasis on non-essentials? And I fear that the same mistake is being made in hundreds of schools. The value of knowing quantities when we come to the scansion of verse is evident, but two-thirds of the beginners in Latin will never read a line of verse. What is more, generations of men have gotten music and inspiration out of Virgil's song centuries before the subject of hidden quantities was broached in the schools. I would not have you infer from this that I undervalue the importance of accuracy in this matter. I have myself given the subject much study, and consider it an important field of research, I only wish to protest against introducing the methods of the philological seminary into the elementary school. One prominent philologist who has come to recognize the practical impossibility of infusing into beginners the quintessences of quantitative accuracy, at least if they are to learn any Latin, has gone so far as to say: "The introduction of the Roman pronunciation was a fundamental blunder, and its retention is a serious mistake." We agree, if we are to regard the matter from his point of view, but I claim that all the *really essential* features of the Roman pronunciation can be imparted to beginners from the lips of a skilful teacher with little expenditure of time and effort, that this pronunciation can be gradually refined by constant practice and experience, and especially by the use of texts with marked quantities. I should require no marking of quantities from beginners, or, at most, only in final syllables and penultimate vowels long by nature before a single consonant. As for hidden quantities and what not, about them I should never allow them to vex their dear little souls.

2. How may a large vocabulary best be acquired?

As has been already said, lack of vocabulary is the chief obstacle to rapid reading. Unfortunately nowhere is our instruction apt to be more lacking in system and thoroughness. The foundation for a large vocabulary can and should be laid during the first year. That is the period of life when the power of memory is the strongest, and that advantage should be fully utilized. In the German schools the boys begin to learn Latin

words even before they enter the gymnasium. A little friend of mine, an American boy, who spent two years in the grades preparatory to the gymnasium, in what with us would be the fourth and fifth grades, returned to this country with not only a good knowledge of German, but also with a vocabulary of three or four hundred Latin words which he had absorbed almost unconsciously by having had them in his writing lessons. No special time or effort was given to it, but it was just so much clear gain. It occurs to me that the same practice of using Latin words in penmanship in the grades instead of English for such pupils as will take up Latin later, would not be impossible. But having begun the study of Latin, practically all that we attempt is to require the translation of the exercises in the beginners' book, with, perhaps, a little independent drill on the vocabulary itself. I know no point where our beginners' books are weaker or need more supplementing than right here. The cardinal point with a vocabulary at this stage is that the words in it should be words of frequent occurrence, and such as are found in the elementary classics that are to follow. But these vocabularies in question not infrequently contain words that are not found in the first classic read, and I have noted a few that are very rare in any Latin. But even if these vocabularies were not open to this criticism, and even if they were thoroughly learned, as they are not in many cases, there is needed much systematic supplementary work. One way in which the vocabulary may be made to grow is by wide reading, and the supplementary reading to be done the first year, a point on which I will touch presently, will minister to this end. But reading is more useful as a means for retaining words already learned than for adding new ones. The following means have been tested and found effective:¹ Let the pupils arrange from what they read, lists of words, grouping together first the different parts of speech, and then classifying the nouns and adjectives by their suffixes, and the verbs by their conjugation. In this way they will soon come to learn the force of the different suffixes, and an important lesson

¹ Cf. DETTWEILER in Baumeister's *Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre für höhere Schulen*, p. 109 ff.

in the formation of words will have been learned. This should not be carried too far, but only the most important and significant facts pointed out. When this has been done, groups of words can be built related in meaning or in derivation. This work is not only very valuable but can be made very interesting if done in class, as it should be, by a live and skilful teacher. A further, and perhaps equally effective method, is to have the class keep in their notebooks groups of words that have to do with some of the usual subjects of their acquaintance and reading. Whenever a new word is met it should be put in its proper group. This, again, is a class exercise, to be done under the guidance of the teacher. For example, a series of groups may be built under the following heads: The City; Its Inhabitants; Their Classes and Occupations; The Government of the City; Qualifications of the Magistrates; The Opposites of these Qualifications; The Duties of the Magistrates; The Sights of a City. Under the first head, "The City," let the students write *urbs, oppidum*. Under the second, "Its Inhabitants," *cives, incolae, homines, viri, mulieres, feminae, senes, filii, filiae, pueri, liberi*, etc.; also the verbs *incolere, habitare*. Under the third heading, "Their Classes and Occupations," have them write *agricolae, artifices, fabri, magistri, mercatores, milites, nuntii, sacerdotes, scriptores, servi*, etc., adding each word as it is met in the reading. I will not carry the illustration farther, as I think the plan is clear. The fundamental principle of all these devices is the same, namely, that words are best remembered in relations. A little time spent here, say half as much as some are giving to the marking of hidden quantities, will yield wonderful results in the ability to read Latin.

3. How shall forms be taught?

Forms share, with the vocabulary, the first place in the work of the first year. Students that do not learn them well then are apt to limp badly forever after. To our boys and girls inflection is a strange and difficult thing. His German cousin across the sea, who has absorbed *der, die, das*, and the incongruities of Teutonic genders with his mother's milk, finds all this *ganz natürlich*, but even there I have been surprised to observe how

carefully the teachers lead up to and develop the notion of case relation and case and form, the keynote to the instruction being that they in every instance work from a known phenomenon in German to its parallel in Latin. In this way they will spend three or four days on the first declension. In my younger and more confident days I did not hesitate to assign the whole of the first declension, including exercises, in a single lesson. I now think that a little more time spent here would have saved time in the end, for I am sure that many students have little conception of the real meaning and force of a case termination for a long time after they have left the first declension far behind them. Our language does not admit of the comparisons in form that the German does, but it does furnish a few that are very useful right here. To mention only one, by calling attention to the inflection of our interrogative-relative *who*, *whose*, *whom*, and the respective force of each case, we may hope for an intelligent grasp of the nominative, genitive, and accusative case, the nominative answering the question *who*, the genitive *whose*, and the accusative *whom*. Again I say, time spent here is not wasted.

It is always a temptation to a teacher of a philological turn of mind to do more than is wise with the formation of the different cases. Interesting and useful as this is for more advanced pupils, it is doubtless true that it is much easier for the child to remember a form as a whole than it is to remember its constituent parts and construct it. This is still more true where the formations are difficult and hard to trace, as in the case forms. I am even in doubt whether we do not lose more in good pedagogy than we gain in scientific accuracy when we tell a boy that the stem of nouns of the first declension ends in *ā* and in the second in *o*, in view of the fact that the stem vowel fails to appear in so many of the cases. This puzzles and confuses the pupil far more than the scientific truth helps him. For all practical and useful ends I think it would be quite as useful to teach beginners that the stem of a word is the part that does not change, and the variable part the termination. On the other hand, there are some matters of formation that should be pointed

out because they have a positive value in the identification of forms. Chief among these are the tense signs of the verb.

Another danger is that we may teach forms that have no practical value in actual use, or burden the memory with useless rules and exceptions that have come down to us from the ages and still find a place in many grammars and beginners' books. For example there is the hackneyed rule that names of towns are feminine, whereas the fact is that names of towns follow the gender of their termination just the same as other words, apparent exceptions being when foreign towns keep the gender of their native language, for example *Corinthus* being fem. in Greek remains so in Latin, while *Bibracte* being neuter in Celtic remains so. The rules for gender in the third declension with their numerous exceptions are of little practical value. Of them all there are not more than five or six that are useful. In this same declension pupils should be taught the principal rules by which we distinguish the I stems; beyond that I should teach them only that masc. and fem. have *ium* in the gen. plur. and *is* or *es* in the acc. plur., and that neut. I stems have *i* in the abl. sing., *ia* in the nom. and acc. plur. and *ium* in the gen. plur. Further minutiae are not necessary at this stage of progress. If students learn more it is apt to be *in futuram oblivionem*. In the fourth declension the apparent irregularity of *-ubus* instead of *-ibus* is only a difference in orthography, *tribus* being the only word that has only *-ubus*. This matter may therefore be safely omitted with beginners. In the conjugation of the verb the grammars, for the sake of system presumably, give a third person imperative and a passive imperative, practically, however, these forms do not appear in actual use and may be omitted. The same may be said of the forms of *eo* in the perfect tenses with inserted *v*. This *v* is always thrown out, and when *s* follows *ii*, contraction takes place. These are only a few of the cases where the work on forms can be simplified and abbreviated.

I need scarcely emphasize the absolute necessity for thorough drill here. It is the *sine qua non* for the mastery of the language. German writers on Latin pedagogy often speak of transforming the forms into the flesh and blood of their pupils, and indeed

the expression is none too strong for the necessity of the case. The beginners' books by parceling out forms in homeopathic doses at long intervals, seem to shrink from attacking them boldly and conquering them. But that is what must be done, and it seems to me of vital importance that we take considerable time at intervals during the first year to give thorough drill on the declensions *en masse*, with no false and artificial divisions, and the same with the four conjugations.

4. How much syntax shall be taught and how is a working knowledge of syntax best imparted?

My views on the first of these questions have already been fairly well exploited in the foregoing pages. I, therefore, simply repeat that forms and vocabulary having the first place, syntax comes in for a minor share of attention. Let the weight of instruction be on the former. The principal constructions are soon recognized and correctly translated, and that is all that should be attempted. The formal study of syntax does not belong here. Let whatever is done with syntax be of a fundamental character, the rules and usages that are followed by all the best writers, omitting all that is unusual or peculiar to individual writers.

A working knowledge of syntax is imparted by the study of rules and the examples under them, by reading and a study of the text, and by the writing of English into Latin. Most are agreed that the second of these means is the most effective, but this method belongs rather to the more advanced courses, and lies outside of this discussion. What is done with syntax the first year is accomplished mainly through the other two methods. The study of rules and examples is especially open to the danger of self deception on the part of the student and a false presumption of knowledge on the part of the teacher, unless the rules are very clearly stated and the examples very simple. Even then a full and careful explanation by the teacher with copious parallel constructions from English, where such exist, seems to me imperative. We little know how much ignorance and what absurdities the glib recitation of a rule often conceals. One of our most distinguished Latinists told me that he went through

the high school reciting with great satisfaction to himself and with the approval of his teacher the astonishing statement that "*cum* casual takes the subjunctive." The study of rules and examples is usually followed by a translation of illustrative sentences from English into Latin. This, if done with thought and intelligence, is of some value, but it is apt to be a mere mechanical copying of the examples. But this leads us naturally to the next question of our discussion.

5. What is the relative value of translating from English into Latin and from Latin into English?

I presume that we are all agreed that our aim in having English translated into Latin is to increase vocabulary and to enlarge the knowledge of syntax for the use that can be made of both in the reading of Latin, rather than with the hope or design of teaching the art of writing Latin as an end in itself. To write good Latin is an elegant accomplishment the acquisition of which calls for an immense amount of labor and practice, and has come to be almost a lost art. The time has passed when the learned world found it necessary to use Latin as a means of communication, and with the passing of its practical utility the cultivation of the art began to diminish. The inherent difficulty of the work and the notoriously poor results that we obtain from it have led many to question whether we are not giving it too much time, and whether other methods of drill in vocabulary and syntax would not yield more fruit. I think this question particularly pertinent in the first year, where syntax plays a subsidiary part anyhow, and where we can employ more effective ways of teaching vocabulary. In the German gymnasia very little translation from German into Latin is called for in the lowest grades, that is written translation; but much oral drill is given with very easy sentences. That method has the advantage that many more sentences can be given orally than can be written, and that the work is done in class under the guidance of the teacher. With this method, too, the countless variations that can be made in a single simple sentence in tense, mood, case, etc., afford excellent drill in forms: a point in which the written exercise of seven or eight sentences is much inferior, for in the

preparation of these, the student is quite sure to follow the path of least resistance and copy the needed forms from his paradigms. I am of the opinion that most beginners' books give too many sentences for translation into Latin, and that most of these sentences are too hard, and that some of the time spent on these could be used to better advantage on forms and vocabulary, and the translation of Latin into English. The relation between the ability to trace out and identify Latin constructions in English forms of thought is not as closely connected with the ability to translate Latin into English as we are apt to suppose. The latter object can and often is successfully pursued without the former, and our fundamental aim is to read Latin.

The Latin text, on the contrary, and its translation into good idiomatic English is the basis and end of all our training. The text gives the material for drill on forms and the making of a vocabulary. It also gives the best introduction to the study of syntax, a knowledge of which should be gradually built up from the inductive study of the text. And the translation into English, affording as it does an unrivaled field for the study of our own language, is the chief justification for the place that Latin fills in our curriculum. But my mention of text and translation seems to belong rather to the work of the higher classes, and naturally leads to the question of what reading, if any, should be attempted the first year.

6. What should we read?

In my opinion simple connected reading should be in the hands of beginners in Latin at the earliest possible moment, and here more than anywhere else, perhaps, the teacher needs to supplement the slender and inadequate resources of the average text-book. By omitting half of the sentences designed for translation into Latin, adequate time will be found. It was the great Ritschl who, when asked for advice in mastering Latin, said, "Lesen, viel lesen, sehr viel lesen, sehr viel viel lesen." While a certain number of detached sentences continue to be necessary for illustrative purposes, the structure of the Latin sentence can be learned only from connected narrative, and it is

unfamiliarity with this, next to forms and vocabulary, that bars the gate to the young Latinist. The lack of suitable matter from the ancient classics at once presents itself, for it is a well-known fact that the Romans did not write expressly for our babes and sucklings. But there is an abundance of material, if we are wise enough to use it. Many teachers seem to think that any Latin that does not bear the classic brand is necessarily bad Latin, and will carry dangerous contagion of poor grammar and barbarous syntax into our schools. But the Latin schools of Europe have never hesitated to manufacture what was needed for their elementary classes, and have not only not suffered therefrom, but with most excellent results. And there is no reason why bad results should be feared. Much of this modern Latin is far from being poor, and some of it would not disgrace Cicero himself. Some of the best collections of this nature known to me for beginners are the following: Meurer, *Lateinisches Lesebuch für Sexta*; Perthes, *Lateinisches Lesebuch für Sexta*, also *für Quinta*; Oehler, Schubert, and Sturmhoefel, *Übungsbuch für den grammatischen Unterricht im Lateinischen für Sexta*; and Ritchie, *Fabulae Faciles*. Any enterprising teacher could easily take from such sources as these as much supplementary reading as was needed, and, by means of hektograph or typewriter, furnish his pupils with it. The selections have the following distinct advantages: they are connected Latin and not the *disiecta membra* of mutilated classical remains; they are not too hard, they develop power in the pupil and do not discourage him; they are interesting in themselves and are worth translating, a reward for the labor of translating that pupils have a right to expect; most of them in subject-matter are connected with Roman life, custom, and tradition, and are a valuable introduction to the work that follows; and, lastly, they are to be preferred to an emasculated edition of a later classic, because such preliminary reading destroys all subsequent interest in it on the part of the pupil.

I cannot close this paper without adding a word with reference to the teacher of first-year Latin, for he, after all, is a more important factor than any book or any method. I have spent

many years of my life in the preparation of Latin teachers for the secondary schools, and every now and then some half-prepared candidate for a Latin position will come to me for a recommendation and say: "I know that my preparation is deficient, but will you not recommend me for the beginners' work? I am sure I could do that." "Any year but that," I reply. Nowhere is the need greater for skill, experience and knowledge. Put the strongest and best teacher you have in charge of the first year, and a weaker one will do well enough in the second, third, or fourth. And I wish to plead in this connection, and especially for the beginners' class, for more real teaching and less mere hearing of lessons. The recitation hour should be most valuable for the development and application of new knowledge. No new principle or new matter of any description should be assigned for an advance lesson that has not been carefully and fully developed by the teacher before the pupils, and with their co-operation. My observation leads me to fear, however, that in our schools this is more usually the exception than the rule. A difficult advance lesson assigned with no explanation one day becomes the slovenly and half-prepared, because half-understood, recitation of the next; and at the end of the nervous and trying hour for both pupils and teacher he has barely time at the stroke of the bell to shout, "The next lesson in advance for tomorrow," and so the sad work goes on. I would that I were exaggerating, but I know whereof I speak. The amount of time and energy that pupils waste in misdirected and unintelligent study is appalling.

Finally, it seems to me wise that in the division of work in a high school the teachers of Latin should also be in charge of the classes in ancient history and English language. The opportunities for mutual and helpful correlation between these subjects and Latin are so numerous and obvious as not to need mention.

I conclude with a résumé of the suggestions made:

1. The essentials of a good pronunciation are best taught by imitation. The teacher should be the model. Marking of vowels is of minor importance, and should be dealt with accordingly.

2. A large vocabulary should be acquired. This is best accomplished by the systematic making and study of word lists and copious reading.

3. The thorough mastery of forms is of vital importance at this stage. Scientific explanations of formations are not in place.

4. Syntax should have a secondary place. Little formal study should be done, but the student should be taught to recognize the principal constructions in his reading.

5. The value of translating from English into Latin is sometimes overrated. On the contrary, the value of translating from Latin into idiomatic English cannot be overrated.

6. Read as much simple connected Latin as possible. Use modern sources where ancient ones fail.

7. Put the strongest teacher in charge of the beginners' class.

8. Correlate the work in English language, ancient history, and Latin.

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGÉ.

MICHIGAN STATE NORMAL COLLEGE.